

S/N 10/726,917

DEC 27 2006

Response to Office Action Dated 11/28/2006

REMARKS

A review of the claims indicates that:

A) Claims 2—5, 9—12, 26—29 and 32—35 remain in their original form.

B) Claims 1, 6—8, 25, 30 and 31 are previously presented.

C) Claims 13—24 and 36—41 are withdrawn.

In view of the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Restriction and examination of all claims.

The Office Action dated 11/28/2006 requires Applicant to elect one of five (5) groups of claims, i.e., Groups I—V.

The Applicant hereby elects Group I, which includes claims 1—12 and 25—35. However, this election is made with traverse for the following reasons.

M.P.E.P. § 803 states that an application may be properly restricted only if (1) the inventions are independent or distinct as claimed, and (2) there is a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction is not required. Thus, even if appropriate reasons exist for requiring restriction, such a requirement should not be made unless there is an undue burden on the Examiner to examine all of the claims in a single application. In the current application, it would seem that the searches involved for all claim groups would substantially overlap.

For example, all of the independent claims recite “variable objects” within a “PDF document.” Accordingly, this aspect has considerable impact on the search, and is required for all base claims.

Additionally, all of the independent claims recite a “PPML template” (Claims 1, 13, 17, 25, 36) or “PPML document” (Claim 39).

S/N 10/726,917

Response to Office Action Dated 11/28/2006

1 And further, all of the independent claims recite "a macro" and/or aspects
2 of "macro selection". Moreover, each independent claim associates macro
3 operation with rules, and usually, *rules governing operation of the variable object*.

4 And still further, all of the independent claims recite configuring the PPML
5 document (or template) *with elements of the PDF document as a background*.

6 Accordingly, the above aspects show that considerable relationship exists
7 between all of the base claims. Thus, it would be anticipated that there is
8 considerable overlap in the search associated with all of the base claims.
9 Moreover, examination is already begun, and a search has already been made.

10 Because of the apparent overlap in search, a serious burden would not be
11 imposed on the Patent Office to examine all of the claims in a single application,
12 and restriction is improper.

13 **Conclusion**

14 For at least the above-identified reasons, the Applicant accordingly requests
15 removal of the Restriction Requirement and examination of all of the claims, i.e.,
16 Claims 1—41.

17 The Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned if any issues remain
18 unresolved by this Response.

19
20 Respectfully Submitted,

21
22 Dated: 27 Dec. 2006

23
24 By: 

25
David S. Thompson
Reg. No. 37,954
Attorney for Applicant

S/N 10/726,917

Response to Office Action Dated 11/28/2006

LEE & HAYES PLLC
Suite 500
421 W. Riverside Avenue
Spokane, Washington 99201
Telephone: 509-324-9256 x235
Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

LEE & HAYES, PLLC